

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
(Attorney Docket No. 18313US01)**

In the Application of:

Scott C. Olive

Serial No.: 10/826,641

Filed: April 15, 2004

For: MULTI-LINE GAMING MACHINE
WITH SINGLE WAGER OPTION

Examiner: Jeffrey Keith Wong

Group Art Unit: 3714

Confirmation No.: 1431

Customer No.: 23446

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via EFS-Web to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on November 24, 2010.

/Jeffrey B. Huter/

Jeffrey B. Huter

Reg. No. 41,086

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is an appeal from an Office Action dated March 26, 2010, hereinafter the “Office Action.” A Notice of Appeal and three month extension, which extended the shortened statutory period for reply to September 26, 2010, were timely filed on September 24, 2010. The present Appeal Brief is timely filed within the two-month period from the Notice of Appeal, which extends to November 24, 2010. The appellant respectfully requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (“Board”) reverse the rejection of claims 23-32 and 34-43 of the present application.

Application No.: 10/826,641
Appeal Brief dated November 24, 2010
Notice of Appeal dated September 24, 2010
Office Action dated March 26, 2010

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(i))

Aristocrat Technologies Australia PTY LTD, having a place of business at 71 Longueville Road, Lane Cove, New South Wales 2066, Australia, has acquired the entire right, title and interest in and to the invention, the application, and any and all patents to be obtained therefor, as set forth in the Assignment recorded at Reel 015176, Frame 0492 in the PTO Assignment Search room.

Application No.: 10/826,641
Appeal Brief dated November 24, 2010
Notice of Appeal dated September 24, 2010
Office Acton dated March 26, 2010

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ii))

The appellant is unaware of any related appeals or interferences.

Application No.: 10/826,641
Appeal Brief dated November 24, 2010
Notice of Appeal dated September 24, 2010
Office Action dated March 26, 2010

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iii))

The present application includes claims 22-32 and 34-43, which are pending in the present application. The Office Action rejected claims 22-32 and 34-43. The appellant identifies claims 22-32 and 34-43 as the claims that are being appealed. The text of the appealed claims is provided in the Claims Appendix.

Application No.: 10/826,641
Appeal Brief dated November 24, 2010
Notice of Appeal dated September 24, 2010
Office Action dated March 26, 2010

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv))

In an Amendment dated September 24, 2010, the appellant canceled claim 33 and added claim 43 to place the claims in better condition for appeal. The Advisory Action dated October 19, 2010 entered the amendments set forth in the September 24, 2010 Amendment.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v))

Claims 23-25, 31, and 32 depend from independent claim 22. Claim 22 recites:

22. A method for use with a gaming machine¹, the method comprising the steps of:

determining whether a game play button of a gaming machine² has been actuated by a player;³

initiating a play of a first game⁴ in response to determining that the game play button has been actuated, wherein the play of the first game comprises activating a plurality of pay lines⁵ at a cost to the player of only one wagering unit;⁶

determining whether the play of the first game results in a first game award outcome,⁷ wherein the first game award outcome comprises a first predefined combination of symbols associated with at least one of the pay lines;⁸

in response to determining that the play of the first game resulted in the first game award outcome, informing the player that they are entitled to a play of a second game;⁹ and

¹ See, e.g., gaming machine 10 of Fig. 1. and paragraphs [0031]-[0033].

² See, e.g., gaming machine 10 of Fig. 1. and paragraphs [0031]-[0033].

³ See, e.g., start/spin button 22 of Figs. 1 and 3, and paragraphs [0031], [0036], and [0052].

⁴ See, e.g., paragraphs [0038] and [0039].

⁵ See, e.g., paragraphs [0028]-[0030].

⁶ See, e.g., paragraph [0036].

⁷ See, e.g., paragraphs [0040] and [0052].

⁸ See, e.g., paragraphs [0028]-[0030].

⁹ See, e.g., Figs. 4-7.

initiating a play of the second game in response to determining that said game play button has been actuated after said step of informing.¹⁰

Claims 27-30, 42, and 43 depend from independent claim 26. Claim 26 recites:

26. (Previously Presented) A gaming machine¹¹ comprising a game play button¹²; and an electronic controller and a memory storage device¹³ comprising software, the electronic controller and the memory storage device being arranged such that the electronic controller can process the software, wherein processing of the software by the electronic controller causes the electronic controller to:

determine whether a game play button of the gaming machine has been actuated by a player;¹⁴

initiate a play of a first game in response to determining that the game play button has been actuated, wherein the play of the first game comprises activating a plurality of pay lines at a cost to the player of only one wagering unit;¹⁵

determine whether the play of the first game results in a first game award outcome, wherein the first game award outcome comprises a first predefined combination of symbols associated with at least one of the pay lines;¹⁶

¹⁰ See, e.g., Figs. 4-7 and paragraph [0052].

¹¹ See, e.g., gaming machine 10 of Fig. 1. and paragraphs [0031]-[0033].

¹² See, e.g., start/spin button 22 of Figs. 1 and 3, and paragraphs [0031], [0036], and [0052].

¹³ See, e.g., controller 36 of Fig. 2 and paragraphs [0034] and [0035].

¹⁴ See, e.g., start/spin button 22 of Figs. 1 and 3, and paragraphs [0031], [0036], and [0052].

¹⁵ See, e.g., paragraph [0036].

in response to determining that the play of the first game resulted in the first game award outcome, inform the player that they are entitled to a play of a second game; and ¹⁷

initiate a play of the second game in response to determining that the game play button has been actuated after said electronic controller has informed the player of entitlement to play a second game.¹⁸

Claims 35-41 depend from independent claim 34. Claim 34 recites:

34. A gaming machine having a single wager option, comprising
a button associated with a base game and a bonus feature game;¹⁹
a credit input mechanism to receive credits;²⁰ and
a controller to initiate the base game in response to actuation of the button if sufficient credits remain to cover the single wager option,²¹ and to initiate the bonus feature game in response to actuation of the button if an award outcome of the base game entitles play of the bonus feature game.²²

¹⁶ See, e.g., paragraphs [0028]-[0030].

¹⁷ See, e.g., Figs. 4-7 and paragraph [0052].

¹⁸ See, e.g., Figs. 4-7 and paragraph [0052].

¹⁹ See, e.g., start/spin button 22 of Figs. 1 and 3, and paragraphs [0031], [0036], and [0052].

²⁰ See, e.g., coin input chute 24.1 or bill collector 24.2 of Fig. 2 and paragraph [0034].

²¹ See, e.g., paragraph [0034].

²² See, e.g., paragraphs [0040] and [0052].

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vi))

Claims 22, 23, 26, 27, 31, 32, 34-37, 39, 40, 42, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. 2004/0072607 to Thomas et al. in view of U.S. Pub. 2004/0106446 to Cannon et al.

Claims 24, 25, 28-30, 38, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. 2004/0072607 to Thomas et al. and U.S. Pub. 2004/0106446 to Cannon et al in view of U.S. Pub. 2004/0219963 to Vancura.

ARGUMENT
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii))

The Office Action rejected claims 22-32 and 34-43. Reconsideration and reversal of the present rejections of claims 22-32 and 34-43 are earnestly solicited in light of the following.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (Thomas and Cannon)

The Office Action rejected claims 22, 23, 26, 27, 31, 32, 34-37, 39, 40, 42 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. 2004/0072607 to Thomas et al., hereinafter “Thomas,” in view of U.S. Pub. 2004/0106446 to Cannon et al., hereinafter “Cannon.” The appellant respectfully requests reversal of the present rejection in light of the following.

A. Claims 22, 31, and 32

Each of claims 22, 31, and 32 is directed to a method for use with a gaming machine that comprises, among other things, “activating a plurality of pay lines at a cost to the player of only one wagering unit.” The appellant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Thomas and Cannon does not teach or otherwise render obvious such aspects of claims 22, 31, and 32.

The Office Action contends that Thomas teaches such aspects of claims 22, 31, and 32 and does not rely upon Cannon to teach or otherwise aid in rendering obvious such aspects of claim 22, 31, and 32. In particular, the Office Action relies upon Cannon for other aspects of claims 22, 31, and 32, but not for a teaching of “activating a plurality of pay lines at a cost to the player of only one wagering unit.” As such, the following focuses upon the teachings of Thomas.

The Office Action on page 3 states:

[Thomas discloses] wherein the play of the first game comprises activating a plurality of pay lines at a cost to the player of only one wagering unit(para 26. Game play is initiated by inserting a number of coins or playing a number of credits, causing a CPU or game controller (not shown) to activate a number of pay lines corresponding to the number of coins or credits played.)

The appellant respectfully disagrees with such assessment of Thomas. Moreover, the above assessment of Thomas appears to be the full extent to which the Office Action addresses the “activating a plurality of pay lines at a cost to the player of only one wagering unit” aspects of claims 22, 31, and 32.

Thomas simply does not teach or otherwise render obvious activating a plurality of pay lines at a cost to the player of only one wagering unit (e.g., a coin). Thomas, instead, teaches activating a pay line per wagering unit. For example, in paragraph [0026], Thomas states:

Game play is initiated by inserting a number of coins or playing a number of credits, causing a CPU or game controller (not shown) to activate a number of pay lines corresponding to the number of coins or credits played. In the illustrated embodiment, up to five paylines, designated by reference numerals 22, 24, 26, 28 and 30 may be activated, depending on the number of coins or credits played. The play of one coin or credit activates pay line 22, two coins or credits activate pay lines 22 and 24, three coins or credits activate pay lines 22, 24 and 26, four coins or credits activate pay lines 22, 24, 26 and 28 and five coins or credits activate pay lines 22, 24, 26, 28 and 30.

Thus, the above clearly teaches one activated pay line per wagering unit and not activating a plurality of wagering lines at a cost of only one wagering unit as recited by

claims 22, 31, and 32. Moreover, Thomas throughout the specification equates the number of coins wagered to the number of activated pay lines. See, e.g., Thomas paragraphs [0028], [0034]-[0040] and Figs. 4-7, 10, and 11. Furthermore, Thomas explains in detail how to implement the bonus feature so that the expected payouts of the various wager amounts (e.g., 1-coin, 2-coin, 3-coin, 4-coin, 5-coin) satisfy a 4% criterion. See, e.g., Thomas paragraph [0046]. In light of the above, Thomas clearly teaches one wagering unit equals one activated pay line.

Thomas, therefore, does not teach or otherwise render obvious activating a plurality of pay lines at a cost of only one wagering unit. Moreover, Cannon does not teach such aspects of claim 22, 31, and 32. Accordingly, the proposed combination of Thomas and Cannon does not arrive at the invention of claims 22, 31, and 32. Reversal of the present rejection of claims 22, 31, and 32 is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 23

Claim 23 includes claim 22 as a base claim and is therefore allowable for at least reasons similar to those presented above in regard to claim 22. Claim 23 further recites “determining whether the play of the second game results in a second game award outcome, wherein the second game award outcome comprises a second predefined combination of symbols associated with at least one of the pay lines; allowing the player to select at least one of the second predefined combination of symbols; and awarding the player only one of a plurality of prizes based on the at least one of the second predefined combination of symbols selected by the player.” The appellant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Thomas and Cannon does not teach or otherwise render obvious such aspects of claim 23.

In regard to such aspects, the Office Action relies solely upon Thomas. In particular, the Office Action on page 5 states:

Thomas discloses further comprising the steps of:
determining whether the play of the second game results in
a second game award outcome, wherein the second game
award outcome comprises a second predefined combination
of symbols associated with at least one of the pay lines(para.
4. The bonus game may comprise any type of game, either
similar to or completely different from the basic game,
which is entered upon the occurrence of a selected event or
outcome of the basic game...The '840 application discloses
an embodiment wherein the basic game is a reel-type slot
machine and the bonus game is a simulated reel-type slot
machine implemented on a dot-matrix display.); allowing
the player to select at least one of the second predefined
combination of symbols(Abstract. In the bonus game, a
player selects, one at a time, from an array of windows each
associated with a bonus game outcome.); and awarding the
player only one of the plurality of prizes base on the at least
one of the second predefined combination of symbols
selected by the player(Abstract. Credits are awarded based
upon which ones of the windows are selected.)

The appellant respectfully disagrees with the above assessment of Thomas. First,
the appellant appreciates that Thomas at paragraph [0004] teaches that a bonus game of
a gaming machine may comprise any type of game, either similar to or completely
different from the basic game. The appellant further appreciates that gaming machines
have been implemented with a bonus game providing a simulated reel-type slot
machine. However, the appellant respectfully points out that paragraph [0004] is
describing aspects found in gaming machines that predate the Thomas gaming
machine. Paragraph [0004] is not describing aspects of the Thomas gaming machine.
As such, aspects of paragraph [0004] are not relevant to the operation of the Thomas
gaming machine which is described in the Abstract and other portions of the

specification. This is especially true given that the bonus game of the Thomas gaming machine is not a simulated reel-type slot machine.

As explained in the Abstract and elsewhere, in the bonus game of Thomas, a player selects, one at a time, from an array of windows each associated with a bonus game outcome. Credits are awarded based upon which ones of the windows are selected. The bonus game ends upon selection of a window associated with an end-bonus outcome. Thomas, however, never indicates that the array of windows are implemented as a reel-type game. Furthermore, Thomas never explains or suggests that such an array of windows may be implemented as a reel-type game. As such, the Thomas array of windows presented during the Thomas bonus game do not define a second game award outcome that comprises a second predefined combination of symbols associated with at least one of the pay lines. In Thomas, each window in the bonus game has an award outcome, but there is no teaching of a predefined combination of such windows associated with a pay line providing an award outcome. See, e.g., Thomas paragraph [0049].

Furthermore, there is nothing in Thomas or Cannon to suggest implementing the array of windows provided by the Thomas bonus game as a reel-type game. Thomas merely identifies various types of bonus games in its background section. Thomas then presents a new type of bonus game in which an array of windows is shown and a player may select such windows until an end-game outcome of one of the windows is selected. The appellant respectfully submits there is no reason in light of the teachings of Thomas and Cannon that one skilled in the art would modify the Thomas bonus game in a manner that arrives at the invention of claim 23. Thomas' bonus game operates in a fundamentally different manner than a reel-type game. In Thomas, each window provides an award outcome regardless of position. In a reel-type game, a

combination of symbols provides an award outcome if aligned with a payline. Due to such fundamental differences, implementing the Thomas' bonus game as a reel-type game is not obvious based upon the teachings of Thomas and Cannon. As such, Thomas, in combination with Cannon, simply does not teach a bonus game having a second game award outcome that comprises a second predefined combination of symbols *associated with at least one of the pay lines.*

C. Claims 26, 42, and 43

Each of claims 26, 42, and 43 is directed to a gaming machine that comprises, among other things, "an electronic controller ... wherein processing of the software by the electronic controller causes the electronic controller to: initiate a play of a first game in response to determining that the game play button has been actuated, wherein the play of the first game comprises activating a plurality of pay lines at a cost to the player of only one wagering unit." Similar aspects are present in claim 22. Accordingly, each of claims 26, 42, and 43 is allowable for at least reasons similar to those presented above in regard to claim 22. Reversal of the present rejection of claims 26, 42, and 43 is therefore respectfully requested.

D. Claim 27

Claim 27 includes claim 26 as a base claim and is therefore allowable for at least reasons similar to those presented above in regard to claim 26. Moreover, the appellant respectfully submits that the reasons presented above in regard to claim 23 are also generally applicable to the patentability of claim 27. Accordingly, the appellant respectfully requests reversal of the present rejection of claim 27 for one or more of the above reasons.

E. Claims 34 and 35

Each of claims 34 and 35 is directed to a gaming machine having a single wager option, that comprises among other things, “a controller to initiate the base game in response to actuation of the button if sufficient credits remain to cover the single wager option, and to initiate the bonus feature game in response to actuation of the button if an award outcome of the base game entitles play of the bonus feature game.” The appellant respectfully submits that the combination of Thomas and Cannon does not teach or otherwise render obvious such aspects of claims 34 and 35.

In regard to such “single wager option” aspects, the Office Action relies solely upon Thomas. In particular, the Office Action takes the position that Thomas discloses all aspects of claim 34 except for “a button associated with a base game and a bonus feature game.” In regard to such button aspects, the Office Action relies upon Cannon. See, e.g., Office Action pages 7-9. Accordingly, the following focuses on Thomas, which the Office Action contends teaches the single wager option aspects of claims 34 and 35.

In regard to such aspects, the Office Action on pages 8 states:

[Thomas discloses] a controller to initiate the base game in response to actuation of the button if sufficient credits remain to cover the single wager option(para. 26. Game play is initiated by inserting a number of coins or playing a number of credits, causing the CPU or game controller (not shown) to activate a number of pay lines corresponding to the number of coins or credits played.)

While Thomas may teach initiating game play by inserting a number of coins, Thomas simply does not teach a gaming machine having a single wager option. Even paragraph [0026], which is relied upon by the Office Action, clearly indicates that the Thomas gaming machine provides multiple wager options and not a single wager option as required by claim 34. In particular, Thomas at paragraph [0026] indicates that

the slot machine 10 accepts 1-coin, 2-coin, 3-coin, 4-coin, and 5-coin wagers. As such, the Thomas slot machine 10 clearly provides at least 5 wager options. The game machine of claim 34 provides a single wager option. As such, the proposed combination does not arrive at or otherwise render obvious the gaming machine of claims 34 and 35.

The appellant points out that such a single wager option aspect is not superficial and provides many advantages. Prizes do not need to be weighted for different bet sizes. The game and statistics of the game can be tailored for the one allowed bet rather than a large range of bet profiles. Such tailoring may result in a game with greater appeal to a target player. See, e.g., paragraphs [0009] and [0010] of the present application.

The appellant further points out that due to the Thomas slot machine 10 providing multiple wager options, much of the Thomas disclosure addresses weighting payouts for the various wager options in order to satisfy Nevada mandated criterion that requires no more than a 4% payout difference between wager options. See, e.g., Thomas paragraph [0046]. A machine with a single wager option does not have such issues.

In light of the above, reversal of the present rejection of claims 34 and 35 is respectfully requested.

F. Claims 36

Claim 36 includes claim 35 as a base claim and is therefore allowable for at least reasons similar to those presented above in regard to claim 35. Moreover, claim 36 further recites: "the base game comprises a spinning reel game having a plurality of reels and a plurality of pay lines, [and] the single wager option activates the plurality of pay lines." To the extent the Office Action equates a single coin to a single wager

option (a point which is not clear from the Office Action), the reasons presented above in regard to claim 22 are generally applicable to patentability of claim 36 as Thomas does not teach activating multiple pay lines at a cost of a single coin. Reversal of the present rejection of claim 36 is respectfully requested.

G. Claims 37

Claim 37 includes claim 36 as base claim and is therefore allowable for at least reasons similar to those presented above in regard to claim 36. Moreover, the appellant respectfully submits that the reasons presented above in regard to claim 23 are generally applicable to the patentability of claim 37. In light of one or more of such reasons, reversal of the present rejection of claim 37 is respectfully requested.

H. Claim 39

Claim 39 includes claim 38 as a base claim and is therefore allowable for at least reasons similar to those presented below in regard to claim 38. In light of one or more of such reasons, reversal of the present rejection of claim 39 is respectfully requested.

The appellant respectfully points out that claim 38 is rejected based upon a combination of Thomas, Cannon, and Vancura. Since claim 39 includes claim 38 as a base claim, the present rejection of claim 39 based solely upon Thomas and Cannon appears to be improper. Clarification is respectfully requested.

I. Claim 40

Claim 40 includes claim 34 as base claim and is therefore allowable for at least reasons similar to those presented above in regard to claim 34. Moreover, the appellant respectfully submits that the reasons presented above in regard to claim 22 are generally applicable to the patentability of claim 40. In light of one or more of such reasons, reversal of the present rejection of claim 40 is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (Thomas, Cannon, and Vancura)

The Office Action rejected claims 24, 25, 28-30, 38, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas and Cannon in view of U.S. Pub. 2004/0219963 to Vancura, hereinafter “Vancura.” The appellant respectfully requests reversal of the present rejection in light of the following.

A. Claims 24 and 25

Each of claims 24 and 25 includes claim 23 as base claim and is therefore allowable for at least reasons similar to those presented above in regard to claim 23. In light of one or more of such reasons, reversal of the present rejection of claims 24 and 25 is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 28 and 29

Each of claims 28 and 29 includes claim 27 as base claim and is therefore allowable for at least reasons similar to those presented above in regard to claim 27. In light of one or more of such reasons, reversal of the present rejection of claims 28 and 29 is respectfully requested.

C. Claim 30

Claim 30 includes claim 26 as base claim and is therefore allowable for at least reasons similar to those presented above in regard to claim 26. In light of one or more of such reasons, reversal of the present rejection of claim 30 is respectfully requested.

D. Claim 38

Claim 38 includes claim 37 as base claim and is therefore allowable for at least reasons similar to those presented above in regard to claim 37. In light of one or more of such reasons, reversal of the present rejection of claim 38 is respectfully requested.

E. Claim 41

Claim 41 includes claim 40 as base claim and is therefore allowable for at least reasons similar to those presented above in regard to claim 40. In light of one or more of such reasons, reversal of the present rejection of claim 41 is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/826,641
Appeal Brief dated November 24, 2010
Notice of Appeal dated September 24, 2010
Office Action dated March 26, 2010

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, the appellant submits that claims 22-32 and 34-43 are in condition for allowance. Reversal of the examiner's rejection and issuance of a patent on the application are therefore requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fees or credit overpayments to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 24, 2010

By: /Jeffrey B. Huter/
Jeffrey B. Huter
Reg. No. 41,086
Attorney for the Appellant

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
(T) 312 775 8000
(F) 312 775 8100

CLAIMS APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(viii))

1-21. (Canceled).

22. (Previously Presented) A method for use with a gaming machine, the method comprising the steps of:

determining whether a game play button of a gaming machine has been actuated by a player;

initiating a play of a first game in response to determining that the game play button has been actuated, wherein the play of the first game comprises activating a plurality of pay lines at a cost to the player of only one wagering unit;

determining whether the play of the first game results in a first game award outcome, wherein the first game award outcome comprises a first predefined combination of symbols associated with at least one of the pay lines;

in response to determining that the play of the first game resulted in the first game award outcome, informing the player that they are entitled to a play of a second game; and

initiating a play of the second game in response to determining that said game play button has been actuated after said step of informing.

23. (Previously Presented) The method as claimed in claim 22, further comprising the steps of:

determining whether the play of the second game results in a second game award outcome, wherein the second game award outcome comprises a second predefined combination of symbols associated with at least one of the pay lines;

allowing the player to select at least one of the second predefined combination of symbols; and

awarding the player only one of a plurality of prizes based on the at least one of the second predefined combination of symbols selected by the player.

24. (Previously Presented) The method as claimed in claim 23, further comprising the step of causing the gaming machine to randomly select at least one of the second predefined combination of symbols if the player does not select at least one of the second predefined combination of symbols within a period of time.

25. (Previously Presented) The method as claimed in claim 24, further comprising the step of altering the at least one of the second predefined combination of symbols selected by the player or randomly selected by the gaming machine to reveal information about the one of the plurality of prizes to be awarded to the player.

26. (Previously Presented) A gaming machine comprising a game play button; and an electronic controller and a memory storage device comprising software, the electronic controller and the memory storage device being arranged such that the electronic controller can process the software, wherein processing of the software by the electronic controller causes the electronic controller to:

determine whether a game play button of the gaming machine has been actuated by a player;

initiate a play of a first game in response to determining that the game play button has been actuated, wherein the play of the first game comprises activating a plurality of pay lines at a cost to the player of only one wagering unit;

determine whether the play of the first game results in a first game award outcome, wherein the first game award outcome comprises a first predefined combination of symbols associated with at least one of the pay lines;

in response to determining that the play of the first game resulted in the first game award outcome, inform the player that they are entitled to a play of a second game; and

initiate a play of the second game in response to determining that the game play button has been actuated after said electronic controller has informed the player of entitlement to play a second game.

27. (Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 26, wherein processing of the software by the electronic controller causes the electronic controller to:

determine whether the play of the second game results in a second game award outcome, wherein the second game award outcome comprises a second predefined combination of symbols associated with at least one of the pay lines;

allow the player to select at least one of the second predefined combination of symbols; and

award the player only one of a plurality of prizes based on the at least one of the second predefined combination of symbols selected by the player.

28. (Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 27, wherein processing of the software by the electronic controller causes the electronic controller to:

randomly select at least one of the second predefined combination of symbols if the player does not select at least one of the second predefined combination of symbols within a period of time.

29. (Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 28, wherein processing of the software by the electronic controller causes the electronic controller to:
alter the at least one of the second predefined combination of symbols selected by the player or randomly selected by the gaming machine to reveal information about the one of the plurality of prizes to be awarded to the player.

30. (Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 26 wherein said game play button includes visual indicia informing the player that said game play button is for (1) actuation to initiate play of a base game and (2) actuation to initiate play of a feature game.

31. (Previously Presented) The method of claims 22, wherein the second game comprises a secondary game series distinct from the first game.

32. (Previously Presented) The method of claims 22, wherein the first game corresponds to a base game and the second game corresponds to a feature game distinct from the base game.

33. (Canceled).

33. (Canceled).

34. (Previously Presented) A gaming machine having a single wager option, comprising

a button associated with a base game and a bonus feature game;

a credit input mechanism to receive credits; and

a controller to initiate the base game in response to actuation of the button if sufficient credits remain to cover the single wager option, and to initiate the bonus

feature game in response to actuation of the button if an award outcome of the base game entitles play of the bonus feature game.

35. (Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 34, comprising

a video display to display the button, and
a touch sensor to sense actuation of the button.

36. (Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 35, wherein the base game comprises a spinning reel game having a plurality of reels and a plurality of pay lines,

the single wager option activates the plurality of pay lines, and
the video display is to display the plurality of reels.

37. (Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 36, wherein the controller determines an award outcome of the bonus feature game based upon a combination of symbols associated with at least one of the pay lines, receives a selection of at least one of the symbols, and awards one of a plurality of prizes based on the selection.

38. (Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 37, wherein the controller is to select at least one of the symbols if the selection is not received within a predetermined period of time.

39. (Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 38, wherein the controller is to alter the selected symbol to reveal information about the one of the plurality of prizes to be awarded.

40. (Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 34, wherein the base game comprises a spinning reel game having a plurality of reels and a plurality of pay lines,
the single wager option activates the plurality of pay lines, and
the controller determines an award outcome of the bonus feature game based upon a combination of symbols associated with at least one of the pay lines, receives a selection of at least one of the symbols, and awards one of a plurality of prizes based on the selection.

41. (Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 40, wherein the controller is to select at least one of the symbols if the selection is not received within a predetermined period of time.

42. (Previously Presented) The gaming machine of claims 26, wherein the first game corresponds to a base game and the second game corresponds to a feature game distinct from the base game.

43. (Previously Presented) The gaming machine of claim 26, wherein the second game comprises a secondary game series distinct from the first game.

Application No.: 10/826,641
Appeal Brief dated November 24, 2010
Notice of Appeal dated September 24, 2010
Office Acton dated March 26, 2010

EVIDENCE APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ix))

None.

Application No.: 10/826,641
Appeal Brief dated November 24, 2010
Notice of Appeal dated September 24, 2010
Office Acton dated March 26, 2010

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(x))

The appellant is unaware of any related appeals or interferences.